

REMARKS

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the claim amendments made in the prior response on the basis that the amendments introduced new matter. However, as discussed below, one of even ordinary skill in the art will recognize that these amendments did not introduce new matter.

In particular, the Examiner asserts, with regard to claims 31 and 42, that the present application does not disclose either the use of a remote control to cause a television to perform a function that results in a change of its operational status or a confirmation signal that indicates that the television has performed the function.

However, the present application is replete with disclosures that the host device 24 commands each of the televisions 22 to perform functions. One of even ordinary skill in the art will recognize that channel changing is one of the functions performed by a television. Indeed, the present application discloses at page 1, line 23, through page 2, line 3, that a host device can be used to control the channel to which a television is tuned. One of even ordinary skill in the art will also recognize that a changes in channel is a

change in operational state. Accordingly, one of even ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the present application discloses using a host device to change the operational status of a television.

Moreover, the present application discloses that a confirmation signal confirms that a television has performed a function. Hence, the confirmation signal inherently indicates performance of the function.

Accordingly, the present application discloses to one of even ordinary skill in the art both the use of a remote device to cause a television to perform a function that results in a change of its operational status and a confirmation signal that indicates performance of the commanded function.

The Examiner also asserts, with regard to claims 48 and 50, that the present application does not disclose a confirmation signal that indicates a change between the on and off status of the corresponding television.

Again, however, the present application is replete with disclosures to the effect that the host device 24 commands each of the televisions 22 to perform a function. One of even ordinary skill in the art will recognize that turning a television on and off is an

ordinary and usual function of a television that is controlled by a remote control. Accordingly, one of even ordinary skill in the art will recognize that the present application discloses using a host device to turn the televisions on and off.

Accordingly, the present application does disclose to one of even ordinary skill in the art a confirmation signal that indicates the on and off status of a television.

For the reasons given above, the disclosure of the present application fully supports the amendments of the previous response.

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner responds to applicant's arguments regarding patentability of the claims over Davies and Ben-Ze'ev.

Applicant essentially argues that, because neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev discloses or suggests plural televisions that transmit confirmation signals and a host processor that determines which televisions do not transmit confirmation signals, their combination by one of ordinary skill in the art would not have produced the invention of independent claims 31 and 42.

The Examiner responds by arguing that, because Ben-Ze'ev shows the remote control of two televisions,

and because Davies shows receiving feedback that is relevant to the execution of a control by a television and providing that feedback to a user, the invention of independent claims 31 and 42 would have somehow been obvious.

There are at least two problems with the Examiner's argument. The first problem is that independent claims 31 and 42 require a determination of which televisions do not send back a confirmation, and that neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev discloses or suggests this feature.

More specifically, Davies deals with a single television so that the remote control need not make a determination that the television failed to send a conformation signal. Ben-Ze'ev discloses plural televisions but does not require a confirmation signal when a television performs a function. Therefore, neither Davies nor Ben-Ze'ev can suggest determining which of the televisions failed to send back a confirmation signal.

Moreover, even if it would have been obvious in view of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev to send confirmation signals from plural televisions to a remote control, there is nothing in Davies and Ben-Ze'ev to suggest to one of

ordinary skill in the art that the remote control determine which televisions fail to send back a confirmation signal. For example, Davies discloses only one television, and Ben-Ze'ev discloses that an appliance is controlled by touching the icon corresponding to that appliance which causes a keyboard dedicated to that appliance to be displayed allowing the user to control that appliance.

Thus, if plural televisions are controlled one at a time as suggested by Ben-Ze'ev, then there is no need to determine which television failed to send back a confirmation signal because the user will know that the television just controlled failed to provide a confirmation signal.

Therefore, neither reference would suggest a remote control that determines which of plural televisions fail to sent confirmation signals.

The second problem is that the Examiner has cited no motivation to combine Davies and Ben-Ze'ev in such a way as to provide an arrangement in which a remote control determines which televisions fail to confirm execution of a command. The Examiner has stated that it would have been obvious to inform the user who had control of all televisions that a requested operation was

indeed performed. However, it does not follow that the remote control must determine which television failed to provide confirmation. Indeed, as discussed above, because the televisions are controlled one at a time as disclosed in Ben-Ze'ev, there is no need for the remote control to determine which television fails to confirm because it will be evident to the user that the television just controlled was the television failing to confirm.

Therefore, the teachings of Davies and Ben-Ze'ev do not suggest the inventions of independent claims 31 and 42 to one of ordinary skill in the art.

On pages 4-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 31-47, 49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies patent in view of Ben-Ze'ev.

However, for the reasons give above, claims 31-47, 49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are not unpatentable over Davies patent in view of Ben-Ze'ev.

Choosing to ignore the amendments to the claims

- As discussed above, the amendments to the claims as set out in the previous response do not involve new matter. Therefore, the Examiner should properly consider them in the rejection.

Therefore, for the reasons given above,
independent claims 31 and 42 are patentable over the
Davies patent in view of the Ben-Ze'ev patent. Because
independent claims 31 and 42 are patentable over the
Davies patent in view of the Ben-Ze'ev patent, dependent
claims 33-41, 43-47, 49, and 51 are likewise patentable
over the Davies patent in view of the Ben-Ze'ev patent.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is clear that the claims of the present application patentably distinguish over the art applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, allowance of these claims and issuance of the above captioned patent application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 258-5774
CUSTOMER NO. 28574

By: Mark Bergner
Mark Bergner
Reg. No: 45,877

July 18, 2006